VISITING SCHOLARS TALK ABOUT THE PROGRAM

The Visiting Scholar Program of Phi Beta Kappa was begun in 1956 to enable undergraduates on smaller campuses to meet and talk with distinguished scholars in diverse disciplines. Scholars make an average of eight to ten campus visits apiece, each lasting two days and including one public lecture and participation in classes and seminars. From time to time, the Key Reporter has shared with its readers the comments of chapter correspondents on the Visiting Scholar Program. To acquire a somewhat different perspective on the program and the people who are involved in it, the Key Reporter recently talked to some of this year’s Visiting Scholars.

KR: What prompted you to accept your appointment as a Visiting Scholar?

Evelyn M. Witkin (Rutgers University): One reason behind my acceptance is my strong belief that scientists need to communicate far more effectively with nonscientists in order to make possible informed participation by the public in such critical areas as recombinant DNA research and nuclear energy. The revolution in biology that is now in progress will have profound effects on human society. I have attempted to explain some of the new advances in genetics in terms that make them clear to nonscientists. I hope that I have also conveyed something of the intrinsic beauty of scientific work and its close relation to the creative process in the humanities.

Mary Ann Caws (City University of New York Graduate Center): At first, it was the chance to travel around America and find out what people are thinking about in the different colleges. But I am finding all sorts of interesting things and am redefining my own work as a result of being able to talk to so many different people about it.

KR: What sort of an impact is the program having on students and faculty?

Caws: A fairly large one. The undergraduates seem to be expanding their ways of thinking precisely because somebody has come from outside and is on campus for so long doing so many different things. . . I am lecturing on art and literature comparisons, and people in these fields seem to be talking more to each other as I leave.

Charles L. Black, Jr. (Yale University): My impression is that there is a keen interest in the things I have discussed, and I received a good deal of good feedback. . . . It may be a little piece of the mosaic though.

KR: The program is aimed primarily at small colleges specializing in liberal studies. What do you see as the future of these institutions?

William A. Fowler (California Institute of Technology): There are all kinds of financial pressures these days on private colleges, but I could see no effect of this at either of the two small colleges I visited on the quality of the teaching or the quality of the students. . . . The places that have people who are willing to get out and work will survive. . . . I would hate to see all the students in this country going to large universities. The great strength in American education is the diversity.

Witkin: My own impression is that the places I have been are in very good shape financially, compared with what I might have expected. . . . The students are taking advantage of the breadth that these colleges offer, and the faculty are giving a lot of attention to keeping it that way. . . . I have the sense that our fine, small undergraduate colleges are centers of intellectual ferment, having innovative approaches to learning and, especially, a community of purpose shared by faculty and students.

Caws: There is a great sense of expanding into other areas, of stretching out beyond narrow subjects, such as “French literature, 1715–1730,” which is all for the good, since that is the only way, I think, that they are going to be able to survive.

Black: I have gotten an impression on these series of trips of the great strength and depth of the American educational system. . . . That impression may be wishful thinking, but I hope not.

The Phi Beta Kappa Senate and the Committee on the Visiting Scholar Program are happy to announce the following appointments for 1981–1982:

Jeremy Bernstein, professor of physics at Stevens Institute of Technology and a staff writer for The New Yorker.

Ruth Schwartz Cowan, associate pro-

(continued on page 2)
THE PROLIFERATION OF AMERICAN POLITICS

by Heinz Eulau

It is fashionable, in some political circles, to speak of the “fragmentation” of American politics and an impending “ungovernability” of the American democratic system. Ungovernability seems to have something to do with the complexity of the substantive issues confronting government—energy and environmental problems, inflation and unemployment, taxation and deficits, regulation and welfare. But it is by no means clear just what the predicted ungovernability would look like and just what the relationship would be between that ungovernability and the deniably complex substantive issues of governance. The prophecy seems to treat complexity as a kind of independent or causal variable. Mention some problem, some difficulty, some controversy, or some failure in governance, and the doomsayers of American democracy will assert that it is the complexity of modern society that causes it all. For some reason, nothing good, no success, no solution, no victory for humanity, ever stems from complexity. If something is to be deplored, it is attributed to complexity; if something is to be celebrated, complexity is ignored.

That millions of American children every day find their milk on the breakfast table is evidently an act of God or due to the beneficence of cows but never the result of a very complex system of capitalization, regulation, production, and distribution. Fragmentation in American political life is not something that might happen but something that, some say, already exists. “Fragmentation and Uncertainty Litter the Political Landscape” was the title of an article some time ago in the respected National Journal (October 20, 1979). The opening paragraph read: “Fragmentation. In a word, that is what has happened to American politics during the past 30 years. Had you hibernated from the early 1950’s to the end of 1979, you would have awakened to find that American electoral politics has changed, if not beyond recognition, then beyond any reasonable stretch of the imagination.” Indeed, the evidence seems to be all around:

- The number of presidential primaries has grown from 15 in 1968 to 37 in 1980.
- There were 89 corporate political action committees in 1974; in August 1979, there were 884; and a recent count put them at 1,153. Labor political action committees grew from 201 in 1974 to 290 in 1980. And there are several hundred other such committees.
- In the early 1960’s, there were 3 or 4 national and a handful of state public opinion polls; 147 polls were reported to have been active in 1980, of which 43 had been established since 1978.
- In the mid-1960’s there were about 150 subcommittees in the Congress. In 1980, there were 139 subcommittees in the Senate and 146 in the House.
- There are thousands of single-issue groups active in local, state, and national politics: for abortion and against, for ERA and against, for nuclear power and against, for gun control and against, for the death penalty and against, for gay rights and against, for school busing and against.

It is easy enough to “see,” though the vision is flawed, why these and many other developments are said by some to “add up” to a fragmentation of American politics, especially if one considers their consequences. In electoral politics, not municipal or state party organizations but individual candidate organizations, private fund-raising groups, public opinion polls, and mass media all seem to have a hand in affecting outcomes. Congressional decentralization seems to have deprived the party leadership of whatever control it once had, to have given the President ever decreasing influence on the national policy-making process and product, and to have made for ever increasing influence of single-issue and parochial interests. The growth of single-issue politics seems to mean that it is ever more difficult to achieve a national compromise and consensus.

To apply the term “fragmentation” to these developments, however, creates a false analogy—indicative of the power that verbal symbols have over what we hear and see. It is not an analytical term but a metaphorical term that gives the impression of our understanding something that we really do not understand. It gives the impression that the American political system today is something like a fragmentation bomb whose casing is splintered upon explosion and is thrown in fragments in all directions. Such an anachronistic use of a metaphor precludes rather than promotes understanding of what seems to be happening in American politics. In particular, it precludes “seeing” whether there are countervailing tendencies that muddy the simplistic image created by the word “fragmentation.”
complexity, objective versus subjective, and so on. These and many of the other dualisms that we use are empirically grounded or logically true. But some are false, like the dualisms of organic versus inorganic, force versus matter, and nature versus nurture. In politics, there are the dualisms of order versus freedom, monism versus pluralism, centralization versus decentralization, and fragmentation versus something that is not identified, among others. It is often difficult to say whether a dualism is true or false, that is, whether just one side or both sides are empirically or logically warranted.

It was the genius of the founders of the American governmental system that their basic mode of thought was neither unitary nor dualistic. They lived in a time that was very much like our own, though simpler and less complex, in that it was extraordinarily difficult to comprehend what was going on and what alternatives to pursue. But there was one thing that they accepted as given—in a confusing world one may have to live with contradictions and not simply do away with them. This basic orientation found expression in the almost Gothic architecture they called the Constitution.

The American founders were guided by what may be called the “polarity principle,” which, unlike the Marxist dialectic, does not seek to transcend contradictions in a new synthesis but treats them as being mutually entailed, like the poles of a magnetic field, and, by being so entailed, as constituting an interactive configuration. Like dualistic or dialectic thinking, the polarity principle assumes that in all determination of empirical reality there are opposing elements or categories. It calls attention to the interdependence of opposites and sensitizes the observer to the coexistence of seemingly contradictory phenomena. The notion that the poles of a phenomenon are distinct but mutually entailed and inseparable prevents erroneous inferences or extrapolations from observations. Each pole (or category) involves the other, and each is impossible without the other: there is no action without reaction, no force without resistance, no center without periphery, no change without constancy, no fragmentation without something opposite.

There is a way other than the fragmentation-integration polarity in terms of which it may be fruitful to think about, observe, and possibly understand what seems to be going on in American politics. It is captured by another polarity that can be subsumed under the concept of “proliferation.” Whereas fragmentation is a mechanical term, proliferation is an evolutionary one.

Moreover, proliferation refers to a phenomenon whose poles constitute dynamic aspects of social life. Sheer numerical growth apart, two major tendencies are operative in the American political system. These tendencies involve two interactive processes that are usually thought of as being quite independent of each other and even as being in conflict with each other. Both of these processes stem from the division of labor and subsequent specialization in modern industrial societies. One of these processes has been going on for a relatively long time and involves social, economic, and political differentiation. The other process is equalization, evident in the ever smaller social distances between highly diverse and differentiated social groups that increasingly share in or benefit from governance. What seems puzzling is that these two processes—differentiation and equalization—should go together. For differentiation, considered abstractly, should lead to increasing hierarchization and concentration of power. And equalization, also considered abstractly, should make for increasing dispersion of power. Why these two processes are usually thought of as contradictory or conflictual will appear in the course of the argument.

The argument is, first, that though contradictory, differentiation and equalization are mutually entailed rather than conflictual; second, that insofar as they are mutually entailed they constitute the poles of a single phenomenon; and third, that this phenomenon in the realm of politics constitutes a new form of social organization as yet little understood and, indeed, misconceived by those who speak of fragmentation and the ungovernability of contemporary democracy.

The phenomenon requires a name. Proliferation seems to be an appropriate term, even though it may itself be misconceived and misunderstood as soon as it is introduced. Yet, one virtue of the term proliferation is that it has not been widely used in the literature of social science as a technical term. It is used in the field of military armament, where one speaks of proliferation in connection with the spread of nuclear capability. The notion of “spread,” of course, implies diffusion, and one might just as well speak of the diffusion of nuclear capability. But if one conceives of the proliferation of nuclear capability, one perhaps captures some meaning that is theoretically richer than that conveyed by the notion of diffusion.

On the one hand, the possession of nuclear power initially differentiated between nations—first between the United States and the Soviet Union, later between these two countries and some others, and finally between all those that had the capability and those that did not. The emphasis here is on differentiation, and in every case the nation having more nuclear capability is to be considered “superior” to the nation or nations having less or none. On the other hand, and at the same time, the acquisition of nuclear capability would tend to equalize the status of those nations that have it. At issue here are not the real-world implications of all this in understanding international politics. The issue is a theoretical one: that the same process involves both differentiation and equalization. This process is properly termed proliferation.

The conceptual distinction between diffusion and proliferation should be clear. The former term refers to the areal distribution of a trait or property without indicating what proliferation denotes—the simultaneity and mutual entailment of differentiation and equalization in a process of structural mutation rather than sheer transmission.

It is not accidental that the etymological root of the word “proliferation” is the same as the etymological root of the word “proletariat.” Both derive from the Latin proles, which means “shoot,” “descendant,” “offspring,” or “progeny.” The proletariat in Roman society was the lowest social and economic class, whose distinctive characteristic was seen to be that it tended to reproduce itself at a greater rate than the higher social classes. The word “proliferate,” in turn, is a conjoint term that combines the Latin proles with the Latin ferre, which means “to bear” or “to carry.” The proletariat bore more children than the higher classes; it was “prolific” in producing progeny that was both differentiated from the higher social groups and equalized in its oppressed social and economic status.

This exercise in etymology is not to suggest that, by becoming proliferated, our society is becoming proletarianized. But if one takes the word proles and the derivative “proliferation” in a non-vulgar sense, the proliferation of social groups, organizations, institutions, and

Proliferation is a useful concept because it provides a comprehensive theoretical handle on a multitude of evidently distinct but quite similar aspects of contemporary politics.
programs may be indicative of both continuing differentiation and equalization in American political life. One need only refer to the federal mandates and entitlement programs: they differentiate among particular groups in the population (the poor and the rich, the handicapped and the healthy, the oppressed and the privileged, the old and the young, and so on), but they also seek to make all groups "more equal." It seems impossible to equalize and not also to differentiate. How to cope with this phenomenon is part of the puzzle in contemporary governance.

It is important not to reify proliferation, to make a single thing of it. It is merely a term that refers to a complex process that is not directly "seen" but must be inferred from the bewildering evidence all around us. Moreover, as has been suggested, this process involves contradictory trends, like differentiation and equalization: some become more distinct and more or less powerful as others become more or less equal. Proliferation, then, is to be used as a heuristic concept.

As a heuristic term, proliferation suggests that there may be "laws" that should be discovered in order to give meaning to and make sense of the bits and pieces of evidence and not get stuck in isolated ad hoc explanations for such phenomena as the spread of primary elections, the growth of political action committees or congressional subcommittees, the emergence of numerous single-issue interest groups, and the multiplication of government programs, as if these phenomena can be understood on their own terms and not in relation to each other. These occurrences and emergences are often in apparently opposite directions and therefore difficult to bring together precisely because we treat them in disparate frames of reference that may be inappropriate even though they are familiar. By calling attention to the mutual entailment of differentiation and equalization, proliferation is a useful concept because it provides a comprehensive theoretical handle on a multitude of evidently distinct but quite similar aspects of contemporary politics.

Proliferation thus refers to a process that brings forth something that was not there before and replaces something else. If this "bringing forth" were a single, isolated occurrence, it would be of interest to the historian dealing in unique events. But the process appears to be generic and to cover a wide range of occurrences. Social scientists have used and continue to use the notion of "process" freely and easily, and they sometimes claim that they are observing the political process. Nobody has of course ever observed a process unless one thinks of having done so when one "sees" a tablet of Alka Seltzer dissolve in a glass of water. One thinks that one is observing a process of dissolution when, in fact, it is a process of combination or composition. Proliferation is a very complicated process; it may involve dissolution (of old forms) and composition (of new forms) at the same time.

The notion of proliferation as a polar process combining differentiation and equalization is relevant to some theoretical interpretations of the American democratic, pluralistic political system. Both concepts, as used here, refer to a social and political organization of society that is predicated on diversity and the relatively free play of special interests, but a diversity and free play that do not automatically make for equality because what James Madison called "the various and unequal distribution of property" is taken for granted and because, if the resulting factionalism is to be cured, it is not all for removing its causes but for controlling its effects. Critics of this democratic pluralism or this pluralistic democracy argue that it does not, however, remove the mischiefs stemming from economic and social injustice. They advocate the extension of democratic participation into the realm of social, industrial, and economic relations—that is, making people more equal through the redistribution of societal resources. Paradoxically, the more a greater number of people participate in more large or small cultural, social, political, or economic units—that is, as social differentiation continues—the more do some people continue to be more equal than others.

Thus the current trend toward equalization of opportunities or policy outcomes contributes to social differentiation and counteracts the very trend it seeks to promote. It seems that the polarity principle, implicit in proliferation, is at work.

One need not see in proliferation—the polar combination of both differentiation and equalization—an unmitigated disaster as do those who speak of fragmentation or, if more conservative in orientation, of anarchy. The country's increasingly differentiated but also increasingly equalizing groups, organizations, institutions, and programs are adaptive responses not only to the quest for equality but also to the quest for access and power. Highly differentiation social policies are similarly responses to demands for social equality and justice made by different, unequal, and specializing interests, which are more and more organized and articulate. All of this makes for proliferation in many components of political life and in all parts of the governmental structure—in the bureaucracy, in the White House, in the Congress, in the economy, and even in the university (better called "multiversity"). And all of this makes for society-wide tensions, contradictions, and conflicts. To explain and understand the proliferated state with its contradictions and tensions is necessary before there is warrant to speak, as some commentators do, of the ungovernability of the American democracy. And such understanding is necessary if one does not wish to rely on old and obsolete remedies but to seek new solutions more commensurate with the realities of the proliferated society.

What these solutions may be remains to be seen. A first step, however, is to educate ourselves about what contemporary American governance really looks like and how it really works. For instance, we seem to be moving further toward "third-party government"—the federal government's purposeful reliance on states, cities, special districts, banks and corporations, private organizations, and institutions such as "think tanks" and universities to carry out its objectives and programs. This trend is likely to be accelerated by the Reagan administration. It makes for great problems of coordination, management, and responsibility. Not "consensus" in the traditional sense but "consultation" seems to become the fundamental principle of governance in the proliferated state.*


---

Heinz Eulau, a member of the Stanford University faculty since 1958, was named William Bennett Munro Professor of Political Science in 1973. Past president of the American Political Science Association, he is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
LEONARD W. DOOB

A sensitive interpretation by a psychologist of the ways in which children’s drawings originally develop in complexity and meaningfulness before these spontaneous bits of art usually become conventionalized around school time and become dull and unwarranting. The development parallels the comprehension and mastery of the environment, especially the learning of language, and can be viewed as a series of almost inevitable steps in any society. But the ontogeny, the author suggests, cannot be harnessed to explain the phylogeny of great paintings in Western society. This copiously, relevantly illustrated book provides profound insight into the creativity of children, adults, artists, and chimpanzees, and hence into human nature.

A modest but convincing “first approximation” of a schema that renders the disputes between two parties and the “stages” in negotiations and settlements considerably more intelligible. Two “models” (yes, the fashionable translation of paradigm or just plain outline) are formulated to describe what transpires in a negotiation—and sometimes in mediation—at a given moment and over time; they are generously illustrated by a skillful and happy mixture of cases from the West and from non-Western societies, especially from the author’s own patient anthropological research in what was then Tanganyika.

A dispassionate attempt to utilize psychological theories, data, and concepts as well as historical and sociological sources to comprehend the apparently intractable conflict between the fearful Protestant majority and the subordinate Catholic minority in Ulster. Topics range from the alleged psychiatric effects of the violence upon children and adults to a balanced portrait of the Reverend Paisley. Whether the neologism “paranoracy” (derived from paranoid) is an apt label to apply to this tragic situation the reader and the future must judge.

A truly comprehensive, virtually encyclopedic presentation by 31 psychologists and anthropologists of what we know or think we know concerning the topic accurately described by the title of this 26-chapter tome. The editors have maintained in their editing the high standard of their inclusive, if brief, preface. The contributors have jammed their chapters with facts accompanied by prose whose style and clarity are above average on scientific, academic standards.

A stimulating, opinionated, aphoristic discussion of the ambivalence modern peoples—presumably only those in the West—feel toward authority in general and authorities in particular. The authority most individuals seek, in fact, is prerequisite, as a result of past experience, a “fear of being deceived.” Many, it is asserted, would and would not acquire therefore “a freedom to disbelieve in authority.” By and large, little documentation is provided other than seemingly arbitrary references to gifted humanistic writers; however, perhaps it is better to have each of us provide our own avowals or disavowals of one man’s lucid, chilling characterization of us all.

ROBERT B. HEILMAN

The notebooks contain diverse materials—news stories, materials and ideas for fiction and poetry, observations on individuals and mankind. Passages omitted from the published autobiography are sometimes quite revealing.

Despite an addiction to academic heavy-prose, Grossvogel does a good survey of types of mystery—the discoverable fact, the elusive situation or identity, the beyond, the divine—in ten figures from Job and Oedipus to Dostoevsky, Pirandello, Kafka, and Christ.


These equally fascinating collections have differences and likenesses. The Shelley and Lawrence letters are superbly edited by professionals; the Masefield job is amateurish. The Shelley volume contains 395 of some 1300 letters; the Lawrence volume, the first of eight, contains 579 of 5500 letters; the Masefield volume selects 300 of the 2000 that the poet wrote to an American banker’s wife. The collections are alike in their portrayal of gifted, lively, and generally attractive people. Mrs. Shelley—author, intellectual, political idealist, devoted mistress, widowed mother—wrote (aged 17–30) to or about nearly every literary figure of the day. In Lawrence we follow a keen, candid, book-judging, nature-loving, self-critical, often jesting student and teacher through his early writing, his friendships with various women, and his elopement with Frieda. Masefield appears as a man of wide interests, a devoted friend, civilized, witty, humorous, equally at home in factual reporting and playful fantasizing.

We learn much about Hardy’s callously self-centered later years in this often-moving story of a failed writer, troubled and slaving wife, and dutiful widow who finally achieved dignity as a generous proponent of better housing and hospital care in Dorchester.

A lively revisionist biography does not defend the well-known perversities but endeavors to place some of them in context. Thomas’s major concern, however, is literary; his work is a good critical handbook to all the writings. Quotations are bilingual.

While McCormack does extensive analyses of Uncle Silas and other works, his major business is a study of Le Fanu as a product of the sociopolitical context and as a bridge between eighteenth-century and modern Anglo-Irish writers.

Frye describes various secular versions of the Biblical myth of creation and opts for the creative power of a “world-wide community of action and charity.” He characteristically traces large abstract patterns of human thought. He writes lucidly, sometimes colloquially, and often wittily.

These 23 essays, mostly about modern novelists, are literary criticism at its best. Pritchett always gets to the central qualities of writer and work in a style witty, gnomic, and figurative, but always fluent, unaffected, and transparent.

Howard conducts a quick and lively trip through medieval pilgrimage accounts, which generated fictions (e.g., those of Mandeville and Chaucer) and thus set a narrative pattern of long life in English literature.

Ferrucci is particularly concerned with narrative patterns of “siege” and “return” and with crucial passages that reveal the author’s creative problems in the work under examination.
RUSSELL B. STEVENS
Garrett Hardin, as does Edward Wilson of sociobiology fame, generates sharp opposition with his writings on populations, resource use, and the issues that stem therefrom. His views are eloquently argued and forcefully presented, in this small volume as elsewhere: the writing is superior. The arguments presented deserve careful and objective consideration.

For the most part, Zaret's small volume will seem at first glance rather too much the textbook and too bristling with what appear to be technical terms. But a little persistence can overcome this obstacle—one can ignore the bulk of these terms without losing the central messages, of which there are two that are major. The first, the author's own, is that predation merits an important place in company with competition as a driving force behind Darwinian evolution. The second, perhaps at least as important, is inherent in the nature of the book itself, and it is that the complexities of species interaction are as aptly studied in the microcosm of an aquatic world as in the more commonly recognized terrestrial ecosystems. The underlying themes of living communities are alike. No matter how disparate the arenas in which they are encountered.

This collection of ten papers is, predictably, a miscellany. The topics include religion, politics, legalisms, perceptions of the relation between man and nature, and land use. Some authors speak about Indians—native Americans in the jargon of the day—and others are Indians speaking for their own people. Some pieces are subjective and hortatory; others objective; some are even a bit light-hearted, still others mostly reflective. Taken together, they reinforce the gathering perception that the relationship of the natives of the Americas to their homeland was strikingly at odds with that of the colonizers who supplanted them. At the very least, they are now seen to have been—and to have explicitly thought themselves to be—far more at one with the natural environment than ordained to conquer it. It is indeed well that this fact is increasingly recognized by that huge majority who make up the modern U.S. populace and who came as invaders of yesteryear, as seen in aftertaste, a civilized continent.

One can choose to "read" this book in the manner traditionally reserved for the National Geographic, by devoting 95 percent of the time to the illustrations, which are numerous and superb. To do so would be to miss information on the life-style of these animals and the story of their extinction in recent times. The situation is all too familiar—true, one would hope, with agricultural activities, illicit taking of skins for sale, occasional removal of animals posing a threat to human life, and, far above all else, rapid and wholesale conversion of native habitat to other uses. It is a matter of individual value judgment, of course, whether the massive salvage operation here described was worth the time and cost; whatever the rationale, it seems for the time being at least to have been successful in buying time.

To be fair, it must be said that this attractive volume is a team effort, though Baker is credited with being the chief contributor. The more usual concept of migration is here enlarged to include many rather diverse patterns and modes of movement in the biological world, and the result is a pleasing compilation. The illustrations, main in color, are excellent and do much to enliven and improve the text. In addition, there is a wealth of clear, explanatory diagrams, maps, and charts. No major group of living organisms—plants, invertebrates, insects, mammals, and man—fails to join the more familiar birds and fishes in the list of categories treated. It is a book not to be read rapidly, but should hold most readers' attention and leave them signally better informed.

More a reference and guidebook than a treatise on zoos, this volume provides capsule histories and descriptions of about two dozen of the major zoological parks and special preserves in the world. In each instance the outstanding characteristic of the institution is summarized, and some special emphases of its displays and programs described.

Both title and subtitle signal important clues to this volume on the history of early man in America. Carter's central theme persuasively to the effect that man first came to the continent much longer ago, some 100,000 years, than is commonly held—thus the title. He also feels that he has established his thesis in the face of great odds and much subjective controversy and opposition. Hence, he is some flavor of Watson's The Double Helix in his almost conversational description of the personalities and debates that marked the years of the controversy. One need not take sides to recognize that this choice of style and approach makes readable a topic that might otherwise appeal mostly to the specialist.

FREDERICK J. CROSSON
This first volume in a projected trilogy, the final work of a free and noble thinker, exhibits the clarity and directness that characterized him. Goethe, Kant, and Hegel are discussed without servility to conventional assessments: the latter two are strongly criticized for confusion and lack of care in their exposition and their conceptualization. Kant's influence is judged "catastrophic" in consequence, and Hegel's attempt to unite the others is seen as hampered by Kant's legacy of the aspiration to certainty, completeness, and necessity. A challenging argument written in a graceful, natural style.

An ambitious and intelligent history of the transformations in the conceptions of rhetoric from Homeric times to the decline of neoclassical rhetoric at the end of the eighteenth century. As rhetoric confronts the polemics of philosophy, theology, and the humanities and as it shifts to structure the writing as well as the spoken word, it reflects the image of man in successive epochs and contexts. Useful and informative.

The first of these is a massive study of the Mishneh Torah. Maimonides's twelfth-century codification of Jewish law, dealing with the form, scope, and categories of the law. Perhaps the most interesting for the nonspecialist is a long discussion of the relation between the law and philosophy. The Studies is dedicated to Harry Wolfson and ranges widely over the fields of learning, including critical studies and some cited texts. It is primarily for scholars, but the interested amateur will find some pieces accessible and profitable.

The silence out of which speaking emerges and that abides when speaking ceases has a meaning that contributes to the word and a meaning of its own, which this careful analysis makes clear. Not the least as Wittgenstein noted, lies in the use of words, though we tend to lose sight of an unspoken sense. Thoughtful and meticulous, this modest study brings to presence what is normally absent, in a systematic development of themes broached by Max Picard's World of Silence.

Hayman's biography is the first in English in many years and has, in addition to some new material, the merit of keeping an admirable balance between appreciation and objectivity. Almost constant illness, isolation, and the increasing spiritual intensity of his ideas, which brought him to psychic breakdown, all make the achievement of Nietzsche more striking and cast glimmers of illumination on some of its themes. Nietzsche's work, unlike that of Kant or Aquinas, cannot be appreciated apart from his life. Stern's book of Nietzsche is thoughtful, is ultimately critical, but it offers an original and cogent interpretation of his basic themes in terms of his "experiments" with morality, the will to power, and the death of God.

Like Nietzsche (whom they do not discuss), the authors find metaphor everywhere, in our language and in the way we perceive and experience the world. To read the book is to become even more aware of how powerfully specific clusters of metaphor shape our description and understanding of things. Indeed, the authors claim that there is no es-
caping the whirlpool and that objectivity and truth are relative to such conceptual frameworks of metooisms. Ours is the second and better thoughts about that, but in any case the examples and discussions are fascinating.

EARL W. COUNT


The gifted and virile Pacific Northwest Coast Amerinds possess one of mankind’s most powerful visual art genres. It has willed in latter decades, but recurred in recent years, in measure as its makers have applied certain “civilized” skills and their thought-ways have been broadened—though their world view remains essentially intact. Kwakiutl Art sets forth the peerless collection at the University of British Columbia and the how’s and why’s of the artists themselves. The world view gives utterance in mythologems and rituals—masks are abundant, stylized, unambiguous. Robert Davidson: Haida Printmaker embodies the recrudescence, even as his graceful lines and gracious thoughtways pass beyond it. Mexican folk-art, so far off in every way, attracts comparisons. Its masks draw upon a wider material stock, and they are more fancy-free, in line, colors, and representations. Yet the mythoreligious of both regions abet structured extravagance, grotesquerie, and graphic social statement. The pre-Columbian traditions are there: yet the Mexican evidences the syncretism induced from a deep penetration by the naturalized Hispanic-Christian mythoreligion.


The written histories of both these late, grand episodes in a yet more ancient and spacious continuum are ampler and more interpretable than is usually supposed. Together, these nobly crafted relations amount to the second and third of a trilogy (the first is The Toltec Legacy, the Fall of Tula). The Toltec Heritage is the chronicle of a decline and fall and The Aztecs is the chronicle of a rise, prime, decline, and fall. Here are the political fortunes that unavoidably struck into the religions, art worlds, socialities. They readily invite comparison with the Old World empire and with the Periphery—there the differences, which at last summate severally to the sui generis.

Koster: Americans in Search of Their Prehistoric Past. Stuart Struer and Felicia Antonelli Holton. Anchor/Doubleday. 1980. Koster has come to be one of North America’s most telling prehistoric sites—huge and eloquent concerning almost 9000 years of human occurrence (ca. 7500 B.C. to A.D. 1200), time and industry enough to show that the Amerinds were far more skilled, resourceful, and inventive than is popularly assumed. This is a happy book. A small army of earnest and intent young people uncover and record under the guidance of a pair of schooled professionals who respect the work and the objects recovered and love their youthful diggers and scratchers.


Yes, there is an American Folklore, but naturally regionalism engenders its idiolects, whether of songways, speechways, or folkways. And “[folklore is] the most natural, un-self-conscious, and sensitive expression of the human mind”; it summons us to “decode its language and learn how people feel and what they confess about themselves” (p. vii). This Reader emanates from the country’s nonpareil center of folklore study; would that other regions recorded their idiolects likewise. Its scheme: Old Crafts and Skills; Place Names and Oral History; Folk Belief; Medicine; Magic; Horror Stories; Ghosts in the House and on the Road: Not a perfect coverage, yet heartening.


The author, a leading specialist at Indiana University, profers of his own fresh harvests, together, indispensably, with some of their context. Thus ends a century of death. The thought-cast is almost wholly Islamic—anything more ancient is not identifiable. The tales cluster as fantasy, the realistic-philosophical, the religious, the etiological, tales of saints and heroes, local anecdotes and legends, animal tales, and humor. The annotations prompt cross-cultural comparisons. The earnest layman will value Dorson’s “Foreword” and the author’s “Introduction.”


The Trickster figure is almost as common as the Hero, and as multiform, which is not fortuitous. We already know him to be vastly ironical, cosmically absurd, parodical, and profound: he challenges humanist and psychologist. The author finds that Jung, Radin, Lévi-Strauss, Eliade, and others have caught various faces (if sometimes imperfectly) of the figure; nonetheless, the whole exceeds any summation of facets. Expectably, the author intends his own theory to apply far beyond the substance of his local cases.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS


Three fascinating travel-biographical accounts of early nineteenth-century America. Nuttall offers invaluable commentary on the near Southwest, from topography to Indians and fauna and flora. The story of Sacagawea is well documented in revealing the part of the Indian woman in the great expedition. The story of McDonald is a well-written biographical account that is also a valuable addition to the literature of the fur trade.


(continued on back cover)
READING (continued)


In Goodbye Gutenberg the author looks at the newspaper, mainly in America, in the context of its altering circumstances and shows how electronics has been summoned to resolve the internal tensions and crises which face the media today." In Newspapers and Democracy, Anthony Smith edits thirteen original essays by scholars and journalists in the United States, Europe, and Japan presenting the nature, present state, and future of the newspaper, and its significance in democratic society. The authors address themselves to varied problems, Sklar’s brief book is perceptive, properly skeptical, and yet basically sympathetic. He writes of the popular programs of the last few years in an entertaining but shrewd fashion. Important for the thinking American, illuminating for every TV viewer.


The volume on religion is made up of essays concerning women in religion from the Puritans and Quakers to the widow of Peter Marshall. A companion volume would be welcome, considering women from the Catholic Bents of Maryland to Mrs. Martin Luther King, that is, southern women. Mary Maples Dunn’s comparison of Puritan and Quaker women’s parts in early American religious life is for this reader the most interesting of the essays. In Koehler’s book we have a severe, head-on, documented, devastating attack on the treatment of women in New England society. It appears to prove conclusively the inaccuracies of the findings and conclusions of several eminent historians of the period and region.


Though by no means exactly revisionist, these four biographies do alter previous delineations of the lives and significance of these early fathers of and in the Republic. Rollins sees Webster’s long life and even his writing as an extended pilgrimage from moderate liberalism to extreme conservatism. Clarfield’s is a searching, probing, perceptive account of the life and character of one of the less palatable figures among the founding fathers. Weaknesses and abilities receive balanced attention. The study of Chauncy presents the evolution of Boston Puritanism from a peculiar form of Calvinism to the threshold of Unitarianism, the picture of a developing liberal who stood for most of what Jonathan Edwards did not. Shalhope’s Taylor will, the author hopes, “illuminate the experience of an agrarian people subjected to wrorrisome forces of change within their society.”


The Riesman volume contains 14 impressive essays by various men on subjects in some way touched upon by Riesman in his own writing. Weld, a relatively forgotten figure, appears in a well-told story of the life of a major voice in the campaign against slavery and other social abuses. Preston on Douglass is fascinating reading for those concerned with black history and Chesapeake Bay history.

It is an imaginative, balanced, but sympathetic picture of a great man’s youth in the slaveholding South and of his multifaceted attitudes toward his native province. Breen and Innes give us a startling and stimulating account, through masterly employment of existing records of one county, to indicate that the black-white relation in earliest Virginia was quite different from what almost all previous analysts have made it.


This is one of the few books of the last decade that should be read by every member of Phi Beta Kappa and indeed by every moderately educated American. Humanists will find some of it already familiar, but they will be confirmed in their conviction of the need for financial support and informed as to the ways in which support is to be achieved.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS DIES

Richard Beale Davis, who has reviewed books in American culture and history for the Key Reporter since 1967, died in March of this year at the age of 73.

Professor Davis received his B.A. degree from Randolph-Macon College and did his graduate work in English literature at the University of Virginia. He was a member of the University of Tennessee faculty from 1947 until his death and was instrumental in establishing the Epsilon of Tennessee Chapter there in 1965.

In 1979, his book, Intellectual Life in the Colonial South, 1585-1763, won the National Book Award for History. In 1979-1980, as a fellow of the National Humanities Center, he continued to work on a sequel to that volume, Intellectual Life in the Revolutionary South, 1763-1790.